

REMARKS

This Amendment responds to the Office Action dated August 6, 2008, in which the Examiner rejected claims 1-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

As indicated above, claims 1, 9 and 17 have been amended in order to make explicit what is implicit in the claims. The amendments are unrelated to a statutory requirement for patentability.

Claim 1 claims a reproduction controlling apparatus, claim 9 claims a reproduction controlling method and claim 17 claims a computer readable medium storing a computer program for reproduction control. The apparatus, method and program include (a) receiving user input according to operation by a user, (b) generating auxiliary information based on first and second event notices, (c) comparing or computing reproduction position information, indicated by the auxiliary information, with reproduction position information from a later received second event notice to determine amount of elapsed time and (d) issuing a command for controlling reproduction operation of content based on the amount of elapsed time and user input.

For a user input skip operation, content is reproduced for a predetermined time for each content block until a command is issued to skip. For a user input play previous content block operation, a jump destination of a command changes based upon the amount of elapsed time from a beginning of a content block.

By issuing a command for controlling reproduction of content based upon an amount of elapsed time and user input such that (a) for a user input skip operation, content is reproduced for a predetermined time for each content block until a command is issued to skip and (b) for a user input play previous content block operation, a jump destination of command changes based upon the amount of elapsed time from a beginning of a content block, as claimed in claims 1, 9, and

17, the claimed invention provides an apparatus, method and program which can implement a variety of reproduction functions using predetermined commands. The prior art does not show, teach or suggest the invention as claimed in claims 1, 9, and 17.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by *Kawamura, et al.* (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0044757).

Kawamura, et al. appears to disclose a drive control circuit 2106 drives pick-up 2104 to a position on an information carrier 1922 selected by a user [0174]. Controller 2120 compares sector address of a sector currently reproduced by the drive control circuit 2106 to the sector address stored in entry point storing unit 2122 indicated by arrow 26₁ in FIG. 26A. When the endpoint of the first section S1 is reached, the controller 2120 controls the drive controlling circuit 2106 to access the start position of the next section indicated by arrow 26₂ [0190].

Thus, *Kawamura, et al.* merely discloses that when an endpoint of a first section is reached, a controller 2120 controls a drive controlling circuit 2106 to access a start position of the next section. Nothing in *Kawamura, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests for a user input skip operation, content is reproduced for a predetermined time for each content block until a command is issued to skip and for a user input play previous content block operation, a jump destination of a command changes based upon the amount of elapsed time from a beginning of a content block as claimed in claims 1, 9 and 17. Rather, *Kawamura, et al.* only discloses that when an endpoint of a first section is reached, the start position of the next section is accessed.

Since nothing in *Kawamura, et al.* shows, teaches or suggests different commands issued based upon a skip operation or a play previous content block operation and based upon the elapsed amount of time, as claimed in claims 1, 9, and 17, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 1, 9, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Claims 2-8 and 10-16 depend from claims 1 and 9 and recite additional features.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2-8 and 10-16 would not have been anticipated by *Kawamura, et al.* within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) at least for the reasons as set forth above. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the Examiner withdraws the rejection to claims 2-8 and 10-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a).

Thus it now appears that the application is in condition for reconsideration and allowance. Reconsideration and allowance at an early date are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

If for any reason the Examiner feels that the application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact, by telephone, the applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.


In the event that this paper is not timely filed within the currently set shortened statutory period, applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such extension of time may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

In the event that any additional fees are due with this paper, please charge our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicant

Date: October 27, 2008

By: 
Ellen Marcie Emas
Reg. No. 32,131
(202) 292-1530